UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,493	09/29/2003	Shizuka Sakamoto	50023-210	8481

7590 09/30/2005

McDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY
600 13th Street , N.W.
Wasington, DC 20005-3096

EXAMINER	
LEE, SEUNG H	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2876	

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/671,493	SAKAMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Seung H. Lee	2876	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 July 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4,6,7 and 9* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *3,5,8 and 10-13* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the response filed on 19 July 2005, which has been entered in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gochnour et al. (US 6,865,086, of record)(hereinafter referred to as 'Gochnour') in view of Ito (US 2001/0006902, of record) and Bridgelall (US 6,895,255).

Gochnour teaches a standard-sized memory card (100) comprising an extension member (140) serving as an adaptor and a memory card (110) wherein the extension member is removeably connected to recesses (120 and 130) of the memory card forming a particular card type or shape that the particular card type serves as a designated particular services wherein the particular shaped card having a memory unit (not shown) that is only accessible via a contacts (118) and corresponding contacts of a read/write device according to the shape of the card (e.g., a MultiMedia card (MMC) is only usable with the MMC read/write device) (see figs. 1-14; col. 5, line 45-col. 7, line 7).

However, Gochnour fails to particularly teach or fairly suggest that the detection unit to detect the present of the extension member.

Ito teaches that a memory card (10e) is connected to an expansion module (50) via a connection (54), the memory card comprises a LSI (51) having a SD-BT interface (51c) wherein the SD-BT interface serves as a detection unit to detect the contact or present of the expansion module through the connection for executing a radio communication functions such as a Bluetooth serving as a designated services, the expansion module also comprises a LSI (56) for sending/transmitting information to the external device for selected service (e.g., transmitting information using Bluetooth protocol), the PIN code stored in the extension module is compared with PIN code for destination device or external device (see figs. 2, 3, 8; paragraphs 0037-0042; paragraphs 0074-0082).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Ito to the teachings of Gochnour in order to provide a wireless communication system wherein data/information stored in the memory card such as SD memory card can be assessed via the RF circuits in which the RD circuits can be detected by the SD-BT interface of the memory card for initiating the wireless communication system. Moreover, such modification would provide an improved security by allowing communication with only those of pre-registered destination device.

However, Gochnour as modified by Ito fails to particularly teach that the LSI selects one application from the plurality of applications.

Bridgelall teaches the dual mode mobile unit (10) comprising a WLAN radio interface (34) and a Bluetooth radio interface (36) for communicating with other wireless

devices accordingly (see figs. 1-4; col. 1, lines 41-49; col. 2, lines 12-32; col. 3, line 16-14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further employ the dual mode communication means as taught by Bridgelall with the Multimedia card having wireless communication interface means as taught by Gochnour/Ito in order to improve comparability with wireless devices, that is, the expansion module with dual mode communication means can transmit/receive data with device equipped with the WLAN radio interface in addition to the device equipped with the Bluetooth radio interface accordingly.

4. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gochnour as modified by Ito and Bridgelall as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Mos et al. (US 5,770,846, of record)(hereinafter referred to as 'Mos').

The teachings of Gochnour/Ito/Bridgelall have been discussed above.

Although, Gochnour/Ito/Bridgelall teach that the memory card is comprise a card member and extension member wherein the extension member can be inserted/removed from the card member, they fail to particular teach that the CPU or LSI receives a detection signal from the detection unit only for a specified time interval.

However, Mos teaches a processing device (404) such as a microprocessor performing transaction detection at regular intervals (see figs. 4 and 7; col. 7, line 53-col. 8, line 48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Mos to the teachings of Gochnour/Ito/Bridgelall in order to provide an improved communication system by checking incoming signal regularly after the extension member or the RF module is connected to the main card for further processing of data, that is, the processing device is checking the incoming data constantly when the RF module is connected therewith.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 3, 5, 8, and 10-13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Although, Gochnour, Ito, and Bridgelall teach that the memory card is comprise a card member and extension member wherein the extension member can be inserted/removed from the card member for reducing size of the card. However, Gochnour, Ito, and Bridgelall taken alone or in combination with other references fails to particularly teach that the memory card comprises a service ID and a card ID that uniquely identifies a service or memory card that is stored in the adapter and the memory unit wherein the CPU or LSI acquires and compares the service ID or the card ID from the adapter and memory unit for providing service when the service ID or the

card ID match, the main card body comprises an external-device-detection unit for detecting the external device wherein the adapter comprises a control unit to stop the information service when the adapter detects the card is connected to the external device, and the adapter has a concave-shaped or convex-shape adapter-connection contacts and the main-body-connection unit has convex-shaped or concave-shaped main-body-connection that fit with the concave-shaped or convex-shaped adapter-connection contacts wherein the detection unit sends a conduction signal to the CPU or LSI by closing contact points between the adapter-connection contacts and main-body-connection contacts wherein the adapter is connected to the main card body as set forth in the claims.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1- 13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In response to the applicant argument that "...references does not teach a memory card including a CPU or LSI that, by selecting one application...." (see page 7, line 1+), the Examiner respectfully provides Bridgelall reference wherein Bridgelall reference teaches the dual mode wireless communication means as discussed in paragraph 3 above.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Seung H. Lee whose telephone number is (571) 272-2401. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:30 AM- 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on (571) 272-2398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Seung H Lee
Art Unit 2876
September 23, 2005

MICHAEL G. LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800